+ + + + +

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

+ + + + +

OCS RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ALTERNATIVE USE PROGRAMMATIC EIS

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, MAY 18, 2006

The meeting convened in Salons B and C of the Grand Ballroom of the Crowne Plaza Days Hotel, 220 Centreville Road, Herndon, Virginia, 20170, at 6:30 p.m., Karen Smith, Moderator, facilitating.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

WALTER CRUICKSHANK Deputy Director, MMS

KAREN SMITH Argonne National Laboratory

MAUREEN BORNHOLT MMS

RENEE ORR Chief, Leasing Division, MMS

MARK ROUSE MMS

BOB THRESHER National Renewable Energy

Laboratory

AMY WHITE MMS

PUBLIC COMMENTATORS:

SASHE ANNETE U.S. Green Building Council,

New Jersey Chapter

MICHAEL BAHLEDA Bahleda Management and

Consulting, LLC

CAROLYN ELEFANT Ocean Renewable Energy

Coalition

D. MICHAEL FRY American Bird

Conservancy

JOAN HARN National Park Service
BOB LINK Winergy Power, LLC
MICHAEL MERCURIO Island Wind Inc.
DENNIS QUARANTA Winergy Power, LLC

SANDRA YOUNG Alliance to Protect Nantucket

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Sound INDEX

	PAGE
Introduction, Meeting Purpose, Overview, Process and Schedule	3
Offshore Renewable Energy Technologies Presentation	20
Public Comment	41

PROCEEDINGS

2

1

Time: 6:30 p.m.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CRUICKSHANK: Well welcome everybody.

I'm going to stand down here, because I sit all day all day and like to be able to stand up and walk around a little bit and hopefully not get in your way of seeing the screen. My name is Walter Cruickshank.

I'm the Deputy Director of the Minerals Management Service and I welcome you here tonight for our first scoping meeting of ten around the country on our programmatic environmental impact statement for the

I want to take a couple meetings just to introduce a couple of people before we - we get into the presentations. Up here at the head table all the way on the left we have Bob Thresher, who I'll be introducing again shortly.

Offshore Renewable Energy Program.

He's with the National Renewable Energy I want to introduce Maureen Bornholt. Laboratory. She's the team leader at Minerals Management Service for putting together our new program for renewable energy offshore. Two members of our team are up here, Amy Wies and Mark Rouse and I want to point out a couple of folks from Argonne National Labs as well. be helping Argonne is going to us get this

environmental impact statement together. We have John Gasper, who is the project manager and Karen Smith who is going to be facilitating the meeting tonight.

What I would like to do to kick off - Care if you would move the slide, is just sort of give you a little background about who we are at MMS and what we're trying to do with this meeting and the ones that will follow. For those of you not familiar with Minerals Management Service we're part of the US Department of the Interior and we manage the Energy and Mineral Resources of the outer continental shelf and we collect revenues from all energy and mineral leases on federal lands on shore and offshore.

We're responsible for about 1.76 billion acres of the OCS and that's another term that probably needs some definition for some of you. The outer continental shelf is that part of the ocean that is under federal jurisdiction. So when you're -D you're walking out from the coastline the first three miles, generally a little farther in some places is state waters and we have no jurisdiction there, but once you get beyond state waters then you're -- you're dealing with the federal outer continental shelf and that's where our -D our jurisdiction kicks in. We are responsible in our oil and gas program for overseeing

NEAL R. GROSS

activities that produce about 30% of the oil and 21% of the natural gas produced in this country, overseeing about 4,000 facilities fixed to the seabed as well as 33,000 miles of pipelines.

We collect about \$10 billion last year from all the various mineral leases. Most of it goes to the federal treasury, but some goes directly to states, American Indian tribes and individuals and to special purpose funds like the Land and Water Conservation Fund and National Historic Preservation Fund.

What we're looking at today and this is Is a map of the outer continental shelf and some of our planning areas. These Is these are the areas of our jurisdiction and what we're talking about today is this new program that we've just received to Is to oversee renewable energy and some alternative uses of the outer continental shelf. This comes out of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which specifically gave Department of the Interior the authority over these sorts of activities.

The Energy Policy Act specifically asks the Department of Interior to put together a comprehensive program to oversee renewable energy on the outer continental shelf and to oversee certain

other types of energy and marine related projects dealing with converting existing oil and gas platforms to other uses and I'll talk more about that shortly. Department of Interior further than designated that authority down to Minerals Management Service and asked that we put together this new program.

It's a program that under that law requires us to do quite a number of things. Set up a comprehensive regulatory program that -- that deals with environmental protection, safety, consultation with states and other stakeholders, being cognizant of other uses of the seabed and \square - and basically watching out for all those sorts of interests that you would - \square you would want a federal land management agency to watch out for and making decisions about how to manage the seabed.

It requires that we issue some sort of -D of rights for folks who want to build these sorts of projects. Normally through a competitive process and requires also that we -- we put in some sort of structured or assured fair return to the public through some sort of fee or D- or royalty type of payment.

There are certain things that we do not have the authority over. One I already mentioned, we

NEAL R. GROSS

have no authority in state waters. The Energy Policy Act language also does - leaves out other areas from - from being under this jurisdiction, including national marine sanctuaries, national parks, national wildlife refuges along the ocean or l- or any national monument. So there are certain areas that have already been set aside from these sorts of activities where we would not apply. This authority also does not apply to ocean thermal energy.

There is a pre-existing piece of legislation called the Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion Act that many years ago gave that authority to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, where that program resides.

Well what we're going to be []- be doing over []- over the coming months is -[] is to try and set up our new program. As I mentioned we have to issue regulations. We have to set up a []- a program for sharing revenues with the states. We need to set up our consultation process. We really need to build a program from scratch on how we are going to manage these sorts of activities, how we're going to manage the process for decision making.

And what we're doing tonight is [] is part of that process in that this is going to focus on the

NEAL R. GROSS

environmental compliance side of-- of these issues and making sure we're considering the sorts of issues that we ought to be considering from the environmental analysis perspective in putting a program together.

The sorts of \square - of activities we expect in terms of renewable energy there's - \square there's quite a number of things. The ones people have heard the most about are offshore wind parks at this point there a couple of applications out there some that have -- have gathered quite a bit of press. But people have come in and talked to us about a number of other types of projects; wave energy, current energy, projects to use electricity generated offshore to produce hydrogen that can then be used as a fuel for other purposes.

We also are \square - are using this programmatic EIS to look at the other part of the authority in the Energy Policy Act, which is to allow for oil and gas platforms where they exist to be converted to other uses. And we've had a lot of folks come in and talk to us about the sorts of activities that they might want to convert those platforms to, things like basis for aquiculture, things like converting them as to be support basis for oil and gas activities in the deep water Gulf of Mexico, using them for scientific research purposes, for \square - for telecommunications as \square

as a way to improve some of the communication aspects for folks who are out at sea on boats or on other sorts of facilities.

So there's been - been a lot of interest in seeing if some of these facilities that are out there can be used for other purposes. When we had the authority over this our view is really that our authority is over that platform and making sure that beat at the end of its use as an oil and gas platform that it - that it's handled properly.

We don't necessarily view ourselves having the authority over some of these underlying activities. We are not going to be regulating aquiculture. For instance, if someone wants to use a facility for a fish farm they will need the permits from whatever agency has the authority over that type of activity and we'd be focusing on - on just the conversion of the platform for that use and permitting the underlying activity itself.

So - Dut D- but that's the sort of thing that D- that we'll also be considering in this programmatic EIS, that other part of the authority that's not gathered quite so much attention as renewable energy, but nevertheless something we want to try and put in place. Well we have a - D a few

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

decisions we're dealing with in getting this program up in place. We have a couple of specific applications that were existing at the time we took over or the time we received this authority from the Energy Policy Act.

So we are assuming oversite of those particular projects, but what we're really focusing on today is -1 is really our longer term issue of getting this new program in place for these new uses that have been authorized of the outer continental shelf.

In developing a framework we have several things we're going to really be []- be trying to stick to as principles in going forward. One is we really want to create a robust stakeholder process. The guidance we got in the act to create a consultation process and to coordinate with other agencies is something that we take very seriously.

We recognize these are new activities. People have a lot of questions about them, people have a lot of concerns about how the oceans are going to be managed and \Box - and how these activities will - \Box will effect the sorts of things they -- they do now out in the oceans and \Box - and we want to really set up a process that \Box - that allows for meaningful input from all stakeholders so they can feel at the end of the day they have been heard and regardless of what decisions

are made they can feel like it was a process that allowed them to be heard and a process they would want to participate again in - I in the future.

We're also going to focus on our role as a regulator. At the end of the day it is not our job to say that any particular project must be built. Our job is to review what is proposed and see if it makes sense. Is it a project that \square - that can meet whatever criteria are established for environmental protection and safe operations.

We are in essence the regulator and - and we are trying to set up a regulatory program that will set the sorts of criteria so people will know what it is that's expected of them, but will also give some pretty clear guidance to folks as to what sorts of activities are 1- are allowed in certain areas and what sort of constraints they're going to be operating under.

Some of our -- our other main goals, on a big picture as a country the President has spoken to this as has the Secretary, the past Secretary of the Interior, renewable energy is an important part of our future and \Box - and we feel that offshore renewable energy will be an important part of the renewable energy mix going forward.

NEAL R. GROSS

We believe that \square - that our task is to try and put the programmatic rules in place that will foster development of an offshore renewable energy industry that will encourage the development of new technologies so that this can become an important part of the country's energy portfolio.

And in so doing we're going to be watching out for the various interests that we ought to be watching out for as a land manager to make sure the environment is protected, to make sure that other uses of the sea bed are \Box - are not constrained by these sorts of projects, to make sure that \Box that in essence that as folks want to go out and use the oceans for \Box for a variety of different uses that all of those sorts of things are considered in the decision making process.

We also want to make sure we \mathbb{I} - we try and set up a regulatory process that works for folks, that provides folks who are interested in applying to do something some certainty as to what the process is going to be like, some transparency as to $-\mathbb{I}$ to what the process is and how they can move through it and \mathbb{I} and provide some certainty at the end of the day that there's a process that is going to work efficiently that will get efficiently two decisions and $-\mathbb{I}$ and

NEAL R. GROSS

really sort of -0 of fix the issue that folks have had with ocean activity over the last several years, where it hasn't always been clear who you need to talk to and what you need to do to get your project approved.

We're going to try and set up a program to resolve those sorts of issues so it is clear what you have to do and how you have to do it so we can move efficiently towards decisions. We're really doing two things in \Box - in trying to get this program in place. One is a \Box - is a rule making that will set out our regulatory principles and our regulatory guidance for new applications.

We published an advance notice of proposed rule making late last year where we - we really raised several dozen issues that we were seeking comment on and we grouped them into - into five categories.

One dealt with access to the seabed for these sorts of projects, how - \(\bar{\textsf{D}}\) how would one gain access what sorts of rights would be conveyed and \(\bar{\textsf{D}}\)-and what would be the mechanism for conveying them, coordination and consultation with \(\bar{\textsf{D}}\)- with states, other agencies and stakeholders, what kind of environmental management system would we put in place, what sort of information would have to be developed up front and how would that be used for -- for compliance

and monitoring, how we would oversee the operational activities from \square - from a engineering perspective in essence, how \square - what's \square - what's \square what sorts of engineering standards should be in place and - \square and how would we oversee the day to day operations and then the sorts of payment scheme that would be set up to ensure a fair return to the public.

We I- we group our I our dozens of issues We received quite a lot of comment, around those. about 150 comments or Some of so. them substantial in terms of both size and the issues they raised and we are working through that input as we try to get a proposed rule together for folks to actually have something more tangible []more а tangible proposal to comment on as we move forward.

The -0 the other part is -0 of what we're doing is -0 is what we're here today for, which is the programmatic environmental impact statement and 0- and I want to first just sort of make the point that what we are not talking about today is specific projects. We do have two specific projects that are in the works, the Cape Wind project offshore Massachusetts and the Long Island Offshore Wind Park, offshore Long Island. Those will have their separate processes as -0 as those are things that -- that are already underway. They

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

will have their own scoping processes, their own National Environmental Policy Act work done for them in parallel with what we're doing here.

What we're doing here really is -[] is trying to deal at a national level. And now I'm going to reach for some notes, because I am not a NEPA expert and I don't want to get any of this wrong, but really what we're []- we're aiming for at this point is to try and set up the [] the NEPA work that should go along with the national program, that there are going to be common issues across any sort of project that happens offshore, there are going to be common concerns and what we're trying to deal with in this programmatic EIS are those national issues, those common issues, those generic issues that will really need to be dealt with regardless of where a project is located.

We're not getting into site specific issues here, but the -0 but the sorts of issues that will come up no matter where you're located. What sort of mitigation activities should we be considering, what are best practice 0 practices for these sorts of projects elsewhere. We're really looking for 0 for input and analysis of these 0- these broader issues to form a firm foundation for the rules we put in place and for the site specific applications that will

follow.

2.0

National Environmental Policy Act basically requires for any major federal decision that there be this sort of environmental review. The decision we're looking at here is not over whether to build any particular project, but a decision on what are rules are going to look like and \square - and so this programmatic EIS is really aimed at supporting the rule making process that I already mentioned.

What we will be doing is \square - is seeking input and this is our first meeting \square - our first scoping meeting of $-\square$ of ten we're going to have across the nation to try and start gathering that input from folks who either have expertise or an interest or some thoughts that they want to share and $-\square$ and we will use those to put together a \square a draft EIS, which will then itself go out for public comment and $-\square$ and further public hearing as we put the program together.

I think I've I I've largely covered this already, but again what we're looking at is an analysis of all the various environmental and socioeconomic issues that will accompany these types of projects, that will identify the sorts of impacts we should be analyzing, the sorts of mitigation techniques we ought to be considering and really, again, form a foundation

for understanding the -- the broad issues that will form the basis for building on for any specific application that we will have in the future.

The scoping meetings, of which this is the first, is -- is really as I mentioned is to start getting the input from folks, to []- to give people an opportunity to -- to stand up in front of us face to face and tell us what they think are the issues that we ought to be considering and -[] and give us their thoughts on []- on what's important as we go forward in this process.

Now obviously not everybody's going to ever be able to make it to a scoping meeting, because we're not having them every possible place. This is not going to be the only way you can get your thoughts in \Box - we're - \Box we'll be listening and transcribing your comments tonight, but - \Box but folks can also submit written comments or \Box - or comments to a website.

So we'll have plenty of opportunity to hear whatever it is that you would like to say. The sorts of input we're looking for, again, are on these generic, broader issues. Site specific issues are not things we are particularly interested in at the moment, because we are not looking in this cross at any specific sites.

NEAL R. GROSS

We want to know what concerns you have about these technologies in general, what sorts of issues we ought to be examining, what the technologies are that are out there that are important for us to know about, what mitigation techniques and practices have been used elsewhere in the world or in this country that we ought to be looking at and making sure that we understand as we go forward in making our own decisions.

Our basic schedule is - is to do these scoping meetings over over the next couple of months and -- and work towards having a draft environmental impact statement available early next year.

Again we're going to take what we hear at these meetings, as well as other information that we're able to gather through our -0 through our own research and our contacts with similar type programs in other countries, to try and build a draft EIS that looks at these issues. We'll put that out there for comment, have hearings on that draft EIS and -- and then work towards a -0 a final environmental impact statement later next year that will come out in conjunction with our final rule making and form the basis for the national program.

If you want to comment, again, you can do

NEAL R. GROSS

this at this meeting and -- and I do need to give a little reminder here. Folks who want to speak this meeting are supposed to have signed in and so if you haven't done that I think there's a sign in table right outside and -- and you can sign in to do that if you'd rather not speak, but have something you'd like to get to us we have comment cards here and you can visit our website at Argonne National Lab that related to the CIS or send in written comments.

It doesn't matter what technique you use to give us comments they all have the same weight they all get the same consideration, whether it's spoken verbally or sent in. So, again, we encourage everybody to give us their thoughts through whatever means they're comfortable with.

At this point what I'd like to do before we open it up to the floor is open it up for another presentation to just sort of give you a little bit of background on wind technology and the sorts of things that we're going to be dealing with and I'd like to introduce Bob Thresher. Bob Thresher is the Director of Department of Energy's National Wind Technology Center at the National Renewable Laboratory in Golden Colorado. He's been working in wind energy for over 30 years, since the first oil embargo and working at a

NEAL R. GROSS

center that performs a lot of research and development for the Department of Energy's wind energy program.

And I've seen Bob speak before and other folks from this program and they have a great deal of expertise on these technologies and hopefully he'll give you some good information to consider as we go forward.

MR. THRESHER: Thank you Walter. I'll move back here and walk around too. I sort of feel like with the room half full I feel like I'm sort of separated. So I'll probably go back in the back and stand behind you, just to -[] just to make you turn your head. This should be entertaining, I hope. It should be somewhat informative and it should be fun, so just relax and enjoy the ride.

I'll go through it pretty quickly, but I'm going to talk about I- mostly about ocean energy technology and offshore wind technology. And if you go to the next slide, I'm also going to kind of hit some hybrid technologies and some advanced application. And you probably can't read this so I'll just give you the bottom line, I presume we're going to put the view graphs out someplace on the website.

So you'll be able to look at those if you $\ \square$ - if you want to study them. But if you look at - $\ \square$

NEAL R. GROSS

this is about resource potential in \square basically in North America and it starts - \square the first line there is about onshore wind and there's some different ways of expressing the potential \square the extraction potential, which is kind of like taking the windy land and adding it up - \square all up and asking the question if you put windmills everywhere how much would you - \square how much would you have and it's so overwhelmingly large that there's - \square there's really - \square we're really blessed with a bountiful amount of wind energy.

It's onshore, it's offshore, it's at least as large and then you get down to wave technologies and that's somewhat less, but you go over to the last column it's still enough, the wave energy technology []-it would have the potential to supply a significant chunk of -[] of our nation's electricity if you wanted to do it that way.

Then you go to title and that drops quite
- quite a bit and that's only a few percent and then
ocean current is also a fairly small number. A lot of
this data about resource potential in the ocean is
really old information that has been gleamed from some
old reports. There hasn't been a good national
resource assessment, particularly for ocean energy,
ever to my knowledge.

So these numbers are subject to very large errors, but the point is there's lots of wind, there's lots of tidal energy, and they're within our ability to harvest those and I'll try and give you a little -- a little confidence in that result. Next slide.

This is what's happened to wind energy. The pink in the back is what's going on in Europe. The brighter pink is 2005, which was last year and then the -- the lighter colors just indicate projections for the next three years. But you can get the -- the growth rate in Europe and the pink in the back is pretty large by comparison.

And -- and the blue is []- North America, which includes Canada, but most of that's in the US and the green is the rest of the world. And []- and you can ask the question, okay, what's wrong with the US? Well we didn't buy into accord [] to Kyoto accord and so the European market is driven by the desire to reduce carbon emissions, CO2 and -- and they really believe in global warming and they're worried about it and they're doing something about it.

So they've incentivized their renewables and that's why you see the pink curves shooting to the sky and the other stuff's kind of bouncing along. So we do have some tax credits, but they're nothing like

what's going on in Europe.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Next slide. Why go offshore? There's obviously-- from the first slide there's lots of potential on land, but why would you want offshore with wind? Why offshore wind? The -- the picture on the left, which you can kind of see is the United States, you see those red spots? That's not the measles. It's the population centers. It's where the loads are and if you'll notice the load centers, particularly in the east is right on the coast. look at the map on the other side that's the wind resource, well guess what? All the wind resources in the middle, all the people live on the edge. have to pipe or ship out those electrons from North Dakota and that isn't easy. And there's some transmission issues that I could go into ad nauseam, but basically it cost money to get it from the center of the country to the edges. So why not just build offshore.

In addition the wind sites are better. The downside is you've got to go offshore, you've got to wade around in the water and somebody put some waves in that water, which depending on your point of view might be good and fun, but if you're building wind turbines you'd rather have them [] rather have them on land with

NEAL R. GROSS

a nice steady foundation. So there are some challenges, you have to work offshore, which many of you know is not easy. But basically there's resource off there and it's located close to the population center and right now it's a little too expensive to go offshore.

out of sight, they're close to being competitive at this point in time. A little bit of help from a tax credit and you get, particularly in the northeast, where power prices are high, you're getting -- you're getting pretty close to a match. You can avoid the carbon emissions. So there is a story there for going offshore.

Next slide. Europe, as I mentioned, has already gone offshore and there should be a number there. There's about 800 megawatts as of December offshore in Europe and the little red windmills that are poking around are basically the offshore wind farms, the big countries that are putting in most of the offshore wind are Denmark and the UK. In fact the UK has a national commitment and they're looking for, it's a pretty small country, but they're looking for something like 8,000 megawatts of wind offshore over the next twenty years. So they've got quite a

commitment to go offshore, as does Denmark.

The story with Denmark is they are getting \$\textstyle{\textstyle{1}}\$ - right now they're getting 20% of their energy from wind, in the US we're getting about a half a percent. So that's the difference in the incentives that are \$\textstyle{1}\$-that are \$-\textstyle{1}\$ that play in Europe versus here. Germany's quite a bit behind that, but has something like \$-\textstyle{1}\$ I think Germany and Spain are in a race for \$\textstyle{1}\$- it's something like around 10 or 12% of their energy from wind, fairly significant penetration.

Next slide. These are the projects in the US. They're at -[] at this point in time no offshore wind installed and there are some projects proposed. The yellow ones are the projects that are sort of in the lead and are -[] are basically mentioned in the []- in the legislation, the Energy Policy Act of 2005. So those are the ones that are in yellow, but there's several others proposed including down in the Gulf.

Next slide. This is what -- what a wind turbine looks like. It's got a rooter on the front that takes the very diffuse energy in the wind, collects it, basically it [] it's like a moving air foil and the trick to a windmill is to collect energy. It's like a solar collector. It's the collector area. The bigger the collector area the more energy you get out.

NEAL R. GROSS

And that's the reason that turbines have been getting bigger and bigger.

You want to maximize your rooter swept area to get as much collection at one point as you can and that reduces your fixed costs, your tower, your infrastructure in terms of electricity. So you want a very large swept area to pay for everything else. basically because the energy is so diffuse you need a large area as you sweep that rooter around it moves very slowly. You have to speed it up, so there's a gear box and then at the back end of the drive train there's a generator that turns the mechanical energy, rotational mechanical energy into electricity, shoves it into a cable and delivers it to your house through the transmission system. So it's really not much different than a steam turbine The main difference is the energy's very turbine. There's D- there's small -- lower amounts of energy in the flow than there is in - I in the wind than there is in like a gas turbine or a steam turbine where you get to deal with high speed flows.

Next -- next slide. Here's kind of the first thing you do if you're going to do a wind plant someplace offshore you look at the wind. Is the wind good enough to warrant a commercial installation. You

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

need a pretty good wind. The higher your wind speed -the energy in the wind [] the kinetic energy in the wind
that you're trying to harvest is basically a function
of the cube of the wind speed. So a 10% increase in
wind speed, you cube that and you get a bout a 30%
increase in energy.

So very small differences in winds speed can make the difference between profit and loss. So you want to do a survey and you want to know you've got good a wind field. There's also some other things that are done \Box - done for siting. In this case this shows a picture of an avian radar, which is to -- to ask about the bird activity that are flying through there. You don't \Box - you don't want to cause anymore mortality with birds than you have to.

So you'd like to avoid the birds, make sure that you're site is not heavily used. And there's also some -- some look at the sea life in that area to make sure you're not going to interfere with that. So that's kind of your -- your preliminary site assessment. Are there any show stoppers, have you got the wind, is this going to be a viable project from an environmental point of view and from an economic point of view.

Next slide. This is just a picture of the

NEAL R. GROSS

technology. That's a GE wind machine 3.6 megawatt machine, it's an offshore machine, 104 meter rooter. If you click it again you should get a size comparison with a wingspan on a 747 to get you sort of a feel for how big this - this is. It's not -- not a trivial engineering feat it's - it's pretty difficult actually in terms of - of getting the stresses and strains and the dynamic loads such that you have a cheap structure, but one that - that can stand the environment.

Next slide. This is a picture of a wind farm in [] one of the big ones in Denmark. It's called Horns Rev or Horns Rev and basically you can just see a bunch of sticks out there on the horizon. That's a great picture. On the left it gives you the - some data about the turbines, they're [] it's 160 megawatt wind farm and there's 80 turbines. They're about 14 or [] 14 to 20 miles off [] or sorry 14 to 20 kilometers offshore.

It's in about 6 to 12 meters of water, basically the technology stratus is right now these are only feasible in shallow water, if you move into deep water the costs grow to fast, we don't know how to do it well enough and so we've got a technology barrier that's a few years off in terms of going to 1 to deeper water. But 1 so it's shallow water, the rooter

NEAL R. GROSS

diameter on this system is 80 meters and they're [] they're a Danish turbine called a vestus V80. The wind speed offshore is right around ten meters a second at this location.

slide. Here's just a couple Next of pictures. This is a little bit about how they put the What they do is they go out and they \square technology in. they basically take a pipe - a big pipe about four meters in diameter and drive it into the mud about 30 meters into the mud and then they put a transition piece on top, sort of an adaptor and then they set the turbine on top of that and some times they work out there - that barge is out there probably putting in some rip rap on the bottom to keep from eroding around the - the turbine. Some of these are in shallow water where there's high currents, depends on the current situation how much you need to worry about that.

There's lots of different Next slide. kinds of foundations. The two on the left are pretty in common use today in Europe. foundations, which is the pipe you pound into the ground. The gravity foundation is a - is a big chunk that basically you take out into a barge of concrete and you drop it into the water and then you put the turbine on top of it, pretty much for very shallow

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

water, like [] like five meters and those are proven designs.

The ones they are working on right now, for the future, is a - is a tripod structure, which is a little stiffer and they're hoping this will work economically for deeper water. Maybe 20 to 40 meters is the hope.

Next slide. I think that's just a picture those are the - the gravity based foundations being put in place. This was at a wind farm near Denmark. The Europeans have been working on offshore wind for about ten years with demo projects of a few turbines, trying the technology, putting some instrumentation, looking at the O&M costs and making sure the technology works, but that's one of the foundations they tried. You can see how big it is, kind of relative in the picture, that [] that's a big concrete sort of a pod that you set the turbines on.

Next slide. This just talks about the electric grid and the cable and that's a cable laying vessel. It's a little hard to see back this far, but if you have to put a cable to shore you need an extension cord to go out to your wind farm to get the power in and there's [] int this picture there's a big drum on the deck, the cable goes up here and it goes

NEAL R. GROSS

out the back of the ship and the ship has actually got tow lines that anchors, that pulls itself along it's got a plow that digs a trench, they lay the cable in, they've got another plow that comes along and basically tries to cover it up again. So that's the way [] they - they pretty simply lay - lay the cable in.

Next slide. Offshore wind turbine access. One of the lessons learned from Europe in terms of the technology is it's not like a land based wind farm. You can't jump in the pickup truck, go out over the gravel road, climb the tower, and turn the switch on or off, you've got to jump in a boat and you've got to ride out there and guess what? When the windiest periods the lights come up and that gives you a little bit of an access problem. So there's been all kinds $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ you can see the ship on the right - right there in that That guy's trying to make it out to a - to a wind farm. I'm not sure who took the picture, but it's a work boat and you can see that - that's a pretty tough ride and then when you get there you have to get onto the platform. They've even used helicopters. They take the maintenance guys out when they need to and they

They take the maintenance guys out when they need to and they drop them in on top of within a

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

cell and they go in that way, but that's pretty expensive work. You can do that, but that's very expensive. So there's been lots of people working on access methods and that's one of the challenges.

Next slide. The Future. This I this is future concepts, might take 20 years to commercialize, but we're thinking about deeper water. blessed with lots of offshore wind, but it's in 100 meter water or 50 meter water or 900 meter water. There's lots of great wind on the West Coast, but the coast drops off very steeply. So if you're going to use a lot of that in the West Coast you'd need some kind of a floating structure. And so we're looking a little bit about the feasibility of having floating structures with with tethers to the bottom. We're working with some of the oil companies, particularly with tension leg type platforms which are shown on the \sqcup the \sqcup on the right here and on the left is \sqcup is the spar buoys sort of concept. Let's move around a little These are future concepts; they're just under investigation. Nobody's built one; nobody's floated one. So that's probably 20 years out.

Next slide. I want to talk about ocean wave and current devices. This technology is at least 10 years behind the wind technology maybe more.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There's a lot of prototypes around, a lot of people with ideas, but there's not much experience and there's no commercial vehicles right now. The Europeans have very active programs, particularly the UK, which has an abundance of wave energy and they're heavily funding R & D to try and bring some of this basically no carbon electricity to the [] to the coast. So one of the things that's needed for this technology is test sites. It's really difficult if you have to go through a full permitting process to find a test site to test one or two devices.

So the testing is a big issue. People would love to have a place that was pre-permitted just to be able to tow their vehicle. The Euro -- it's exactly what the Europeans have done. I'll show you a picture of it later.

Go on, next slide. Here's what they call point absorbers. These are like buoys with devices inside of them that when the waves come and they bob up and down they extract energy and there's various ways of collecting it and bringing to shore, but generally it's a cable. There's [] there's basically the idea is this collects from a single point [] a point absorber so as the wave comes over it [] there's some kind of a reciprocating device or something that spins inside the

buoy that generates the energy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Next slide. This is the Palamis, which is a point absorber. It's under tow in this, but this I you can see it's like a big sea snake and there's segments and between each one of the segments as it moves and I and actuates between the segments there's some hydraulic rams that connect the segments together and as it bends like that it I it pumps a hydraulic flow into a tank and then that I they'll use a hydraulic fluid to extract the kinetic energy from the actuation between the segments. It's I it's currently under tests at the European test site.

slide. There's also current and title current devices and they basically in my vernacular would be underwater windmills. There's a tremendous in going into the water with your U with your rotating device and using the current as you get a density boost of a thousand. Roughly water thousand times more dense. So even at very low current velocities, two three meters a second; you can get a lot of kinetic energy, because the density in the fluid is much higher. So kinetic energy goes up. So these are devices that are basically some kind of a propeller device, horizontal axis, vertical axis, some of them have shrouds to try and concentrate the energy. But

NEAL R. GROSS

some of them look just like windmills. This one down here or the one up there in the top left looks pretty much like a windmill and so does this one. This is a experimental unit that's been put out in the UK.

Next slide. Test Facilities. I've already mentioned that briefly, but on the left is a kind of a rough coast out in the Orkney Islands off Scotland and basically they have four permanent test berths and you can pull your ocean energy device up, tether it, there's a cable [] undersea cable that you can hook up to.

So you bring your device up, plug in, and you can run your test to get your performance. The I the wave devices are much more difficult to quantify the output, because you have varying wave heights, which varies the kinetic energy and you also have a varying frequency in the waves, which also changes the energy. So it's a little more complicated than a wind device where there's just one perimeter, which is wind speed.

The picture on the other side is basically showing working in the ocean you've got to worry about the waves, you have to worry about currents, you have to worry about bottom conditions and scouring, you have to worry about the wind that's above whether it's a

NEAL R. GROSS

windmill or even a wave device you still have to take the wind loads, and so it's quite a dynamics problem. It's very dynamic environment from both the wind point of view and the wave point of view.

Next slide. So there's also been a lot of people proposing to make hydrogen offshore and then ship the hydrogens onshore. This is for the 1 the hydrogen economy of the future. And this is very long That's an optimistic 20 years. range. Hydrogen's pretty far off, but there's a lot of | it's been thought about 1 the 1 the funny cartoon down in the corner was thought about in the `70s for I for offshore and Ш windmills that floated out there hydrogen. But up in the other picture is a large scale elec [] electrolysis unit that [] that basically a multi-cell unit, it looks like some kind of cylinder, but those are basically stacked together, pancaked cells to produce hydrogen. So you can do large-scale hydrogen, but it's too expensive right now.

Next slide. You can also -- if you're going to go out and put a wind device out there you can also put with it [] you can put a wave-making machine. You've got to be out there, you've got to have the extension cord to shore, you've got to build the instr [] you've got to build the extension cord to get out

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

there. So if you get [] you can harvest the wave energy and the wind energy. Some folks think that [] that you can have a more profitable situation. This is a little bit of futuristic thinking, but if you look at the picture on this side over here, what this is a windmill up here and then there's two propellers under water to get the kinetic energy out of the water under water.

So that's a type of hybrid device and the one on the right, the floating one is 1 looks like an overtopping device where the waves run up a ramp and then go through a hydraulic turbine and then the windmill's above it. So because you've out there you've got to put the foundation in, you need to do all of those things, so you can do two things at once, should reduce the cost. That's 1 that's the thinking anyway.

Next slide. Environmental Analysis. This is kind of the lessons learned from Europe. In Denmark they've done at the wind sites, basically five years of BACI. If you're not familiar with a BACI it's [] it's a type of experiment where you go in and you look around and do the study before and then you put in the [] the [] the plant or the device or changes the situation you do it all over again to see what the difference is and you

also have a reference site, because sometimes the world around you changes and so you have to be a little careful about sorting out your impact, because we've done it for wind sites for a number of years and sometimes there's a change in a bird population or change in a [] in the way the species moves through an area and they disappear from area A, they go five miles down the [] down the road and they're down there.

So you got to be a little careful, so you need a control site to kind of see if there's the same things going on at your control site. So you have that that you do both before and after. There's something $\[\]$ a couple a hundred studies in Europe | and basically if you look through what they've done they claim there's no show stoppers in any of this in terms of the environmental. There are some temporary impacts, but there don't seem to be any lasting impacts, mostly associated with construction things. Trying to do both studies offshore is not cheap as you might guess and there's I there's a search for doing things remotely or by some kind of instrumentation and there's look for [а need for innovative mitigation strategies, particularly for temporary construction impacts.

All of these things have [a [] you have to worry about the scientific uncertainties and multiple

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

uses and ecological risks. There's lots of ecological risks and you [] you kind of have to look at it in a relativistic sense. I [] I like to tell people that in our energy future there is not a do nothing solution.

You're going to get wind, you're going to get wave, if you don't get those you'll get more coal and nukes and I and you have absolutely no choice. That has to happen, because the population's changing, energy use is changing, we've got some developing countries that are coming with tremendous on electricity needs. So there is not a do nothing option. So you've got to balance not just is there an impact, but how is this impact versus what else you might have to do to get that same energy.

Next [] next slide. Here's some of the studies that have been done, visualization, hydraulic studies, benthic, flora fauna, fish, big interest in electromagnetic fields what their effect might be on fish, because of the cable to shore, porpoises, seals, birds, and then the benthic community or the hard bottom communities. Huh, that must be different. I'm not very good at hard bottom communities. Sounds [] sounds like some kind of slang to me.

What were you thinking Bonnie? Come on. Here's some references for the studies that have been

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

on that if this is going up on the web, but there's a 2 lot of websites with access to what has been done. 3 Next slide I think is just kind of the 4 5 bottom line. What's in the near term? Right now we can do wind turbines in shallow water close to shore. 6 That's about it anything else is going to be just too 7 8 expensive and European studies don't show any real lasting problems. We're looking at new technology, but 9 10 it's going to take a while and the ocean current 11 technology, wave and current technologies are really 12 just at the first prototype stages. 13 They're just under test so there'll be 14 some demo projects and then perhaps some commercial 15 projects after that. So that's probably five years And then hydrogen that's over the 16 out, maybe ten. 17 horizon for most of us. So I think that's probably the 18 end. Thank you. 19 MR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you Bob. We're now 20 going to turn this over 21 MS. SMITH: Oh could you turn on the U turn 22 it on? 23 MR. CRUICKSHANK: I thought I did. MS. SMITH: Oh. Is it on? 24 25 CRUICKSHANK: Is it on now? MR. Okay.

done in Europe. I'm not going to spend a lot of time

All right. Thank you Bob. As I mentioned before we have Argonne National Laboratories helping us put this programmatic environmental together statement, they have a wealth of experience in [in doing environmental analysis and on on this did particular issue they the programmatic environmental statement for the wind program on onshore federal lands for the Bureau of Land Management. Ι'm going to be handing the meeting over now to Karen she's a l head of Argonne's Environmental Sciences Division Office in Denver, Colorado and the strategic area manager for energy development at Argonne.

SMITH: Thank you Walter. MS. Good evening. A couple of things, I'm going to be the facilitator for the remainder of the meeting while we get comments from the public, before we get into that stage though we would like to offer an opportunity to ask some questions about the information that's been presented on these slides. And I want to caveat a couple of things, first of all we have a [a reporter here who's making a transcript of the meetings and she's hooked up with a direct feed to the audio system.

So in order for her to capture the discussion we need to have people speaking into

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

microphones so anytime you want to make a statement or ask a question we're going to be coming around with a microphone and I and we're going to ask you to please use the microphone, I know not everybody likes to, but we'd like to do that can get a complete so we transcript of the meetings and that includes comments that are made publicly. And also we're going to take questions and answers, just a courtesy in case there's some things you don't understand from the presentations, there maybe some questions you have that MMS doesn't currently have the answers for. We're pretty early in this process. We're just starting this evaluation.

We're just starting this evaluation. So be patient, because there may not be answers to all the questions you have. But if anybody has questions at this time about the material that was presented we'd like to offer you an opportunity. Okay. Well there'll be potentially $\[\]$ oh we have a question.

MR. BAHLEDA: Hi. I'm Mike Bahleda. I'm with Bahleda Management. Bob Thresher, most of the studies you cited from the European Markets were for wind projects offshore as far as the environmental studies and the the BACI studies?

MR. THRESHER: Yes. That's correct.

MR. BAHLEDA: Were there | were there any

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

studies done on ocean or I or wave technologies, 1 preliminary testing perhaps 2 least in Norway or 3 something? There's [] there's some underway now, but MR. THRESHER: 4 5 I don't know of any that I I have not seen any results from any of those studies, but I know that they've 6 But I I don't think there's any 7 initiated some. 8 results. MS. ELEFANT: My name is -- oh I'm sorry [9 10 that's great. My name is Carolyn Elefant. attorney in Washington D.C. and the CEO of the Ocean 11 12 Renewable Energy Coalition. I had a question for MMS about how you're going to deal with the deadline that 13 was provided in the statute, by which you're required 14 15 to implement these regulations, is there some sort of legislative extension or is there anything else that 16 will I that provides for this process to move forward? 17 The I forget exactly 18 MR. CRUICKSHANK: what the statutory deadline was off the top of my head, 19 20 but it was a fairly short time, 270 days, I think perhaps to get to the final regulations, starting from 21 I from last August. 22 23 Our feeling is that this is a major new program that requires a lot of input from I from a lot 24

of folks and we did not want to rush the process by \[\]

NEAL R. GROSS

by getting a program in place where we didn't have adequate time to consider stakeholder input and to think through the many issues that [] that are being raised. The statutory deadline was [] was one that was in the statute, but there are - are really no direct implications from missing it in [] in the sense that if we've missed a deadline we've missed it.

It doesn't create any particular legal

It doesn't create any particular legal obstacles or opportunities for anybody because of that and our [] our concern is making sure we [] we get this program set up the right way and not necessarily the quickest way.

MS. SMITH: Any other questions? A couple.

MS. HARN: My name is Joan Harn and Mr. Dr. Thresher if you Dr. Thresher if you pou'd reported on the Dr. the energy resource summary and noted that it was old data. Is there any new evaluation that's underway given the new technologies that are being developed.

MR. THRESHER: Well the wind [] the wind resource assessment is being re-evaluated for offshore wind. I am not aware of any work in the wave area. There is a requirement in the Energy Policy Act to do a resource assessment, however, there was no funding appropriated to do such. So I think the wind will

1 probably go forward and the others will languish until there is some funding provided to move 2 forward. 3 Dr. Thresher, is it 1 is it 4 MR. MECURIO: 5 true that in Europe | MS. SMITH: Could you could you speak 6 7 your name, please? 8 MR. MERCUIRO: Mike Mecurio from Is it true that the reports so far from Europe Jersey. 9 10 and the offshore along the East Coast could provide a 40% capacity on the wind resource for offshore wind? 11 MR. THRESHER: Yes there [that's] that's 12 about right it depends | it depends on the individual 13 site, but a capacity factor for offshore wind of 40% 14 15 would not be | would not be too high, you may get 16 better than that. We've gotten 40% capacity factors on It's all got to do with the wind speed, what the 17 capacity factor is. So 40% is not unusual and U and 18 certainly the Europeans have gotten some like that. 19 20 Any other questions at this MS. SMITH: Okay. We're going to transition now to the phase 21 22 of the meeting where you get to stand up and make comments, provide remarks and before we do that I'm 23 going to give you a little bit of information about the 24 25 public involvement activities that are going to be

associated with this EIS. As Walter was stating we're at the scoping phase and this is really the first opportunity in the life of an EIS for the public to be involved. It's not the last opportunity.

And just to be clear MMS is seeking your input on the issues and concerns you have about offshore renewable energy development and alternate use of existing platforms so that they can help define the scope of the analysis for the EIS.

what are the things that concerned about. This is the time for you to identify those to MMS, as well as to identify the possible alternatives that you want MMS to consider evaluation; the various scenarios that you examined in the programmatic EIS. That's what scoping is about. That's not the last opportunity you'll have to be involved. The next major opportunity is when the draft EIS is released --oh and let me reiterate, the dates for public scoping extends through July 5th of this year.

So you have until July 5th to provide this input to the scoping process. Then the next major opportunity for involvement is when the draft EIS is released and that's targeted for February of '07 and at that time you'll have an opportunity to review the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

document and provide comments to the MMS. And throughout the life of the project we've developed a
a website, a public information website, that will support your public involvement activities.

And the address for it is shown here on this slide and [] and I hope you'll have a chance to go and look at it. We think it's a valuable resource. Provided on that website is background information about MMS, about the Energy Policy Act requirements, about what an EIS is, as well as general information about the renewable resources that are being examined and the potential alternate uses for platforms. So it's examples.

If you noticed when you signed in we had a series of white papers on different renewable technologies up at a table. Those were just review These are posted on the website and are copies. available for you to download. In addition the fact sheet that you were handed and copies of these slides are going to be posted on that site. So that's what I mean when I talk about background I relevant background information. Also, we're going to use this website to post any of the documents related to the EIS. example, transcripts of the public scoping meetings will be posted at the end of scoping we'll be preparing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a scoping summary report.

That will be posted on the website. In the future the draft EIS and then ultimately the final EIS and the record of decision are all going to be posted and distributed in part through this website. So that hopefully will be useful. There's also a comment form available on the site, which I'll talk about in a minute. Information about the project schedule and then there's also an e-mail notification list that you can sign up for an you'll get periodic e-mails that for an you'll get periodic e-mails that provide you with updates on the project.

For example, you'll get a e-mail reminding you shortly before the close of the scoping period and then you'll get an e-mail that will tell you when the scoping summary report is available. And if you signed in tonight and gave us an e-mail address on the sign in sheet we'll go ahead and automatically enroll you on that e-mail list, unless you've already been enrolled yourself. Next slide.

As Walter said there are three primary ways or three ways to provide comments during the scoping process and one of the first ones is to go onto the website and use the comment form, which I just mentioned. So you should be able to find that and you

can type in your comments. It also allows you to attach documents of supplemental information up to ten megabytes in size and we think that might be a very efficient way for you to submit comments. Another way is to send them to us by mail and we have these comment forms that were handed out.

And you can use this [] write your comment down, fold it, and stamp it, and stick it in the mail or you can use the same address that's shown here to mail other materials, supplementals, stuff that is larger and more lengthy than could fit on this small form and those [] those need to be postmarked by July 5th. And then the third way to provide comments is at any of the scoping meetings and you can provide those comments either orally or in writing or both.

So for tonight, as I said, you can provide us written comments, you can fill out one of these forms, you can give us other materials, or you can chose to stand up and make a comment orally and we've got a few procedures set up to [] to manage that. First of all, we hope that if you knew you wanted to speak when you came that you indicated as such when you signed in and I will be calling the names of people who signed up to speak in the order that they signed up. If you didn't sign up and you decide later that you do

want to speak we'll certainly give you an opportunity to do so.

We don't have such a large crowd, I'm pretty sure we'll have time, after the people that did sign up we'll have time for other people who are compelled to [] to provide a comment and then as we've mentioned your comments are being recorded and transcripts will be available for each of the scoping meetings that are held that capture all of the remarks.

Let's see, the actual mechanics, when you want to make an oral comment we're going to ask you to come up to the podium and state your name and if you're affiliated with an organization state the affiliation. Initially we're going to limit comments to three minutes, again, we don't have such a turn out there will probably be time to cycle back and give you additional time to speak. And we want to remind you that we're talking about scoping for the programmatic EIS, we're not talking about individual projects that examination under in separate independent are processes.

There are different processes and mechanisms for providing comments on those individual projects. We'd like you to focus your comments today on your concerns and issues about the scope of this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

programmatic evaluation. And then if you have your remarks written down, typed up, and you would like to leave those with us that would be very useful as well. That will help us ensure complete capture of your remarks.

I'm going to start now with the people that have signed up and these people I have their names written down and their affiliations and I can give them to Lindsey, but for the rest of you who come up and speak later if you could make sure Lindsey captures your name and affiliation correctly that would be useful. So we had I we had a handful of people that knew they wanted to speak at the outset and the first person who signed up is Sandra Young. Would you like to come up? And if you could state your name and affiliation again.

MS. YOUNG: Hi. My name is Sandra Young and I'm the staff attorney for the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound and I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the programmatic environmental impact statement. Okay. Four years ago the Alliance went on record citing the need for statutory authorization, development the of underlying an regulatory program a programmatic review and evaluate the impacts of offshore energy development.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And the Alliance is pleased to see that MMS is conducting these essential steps to establish a new energy program.

We must, however, object strongly to the review of any individual project including Cape Wind prior to the completion of the programmatic EIS and the development of regulations. Any such premature review undermines the value and purpose of the national programmatic Ιt program and the EIS. also significantly obstructs efforts to protect valuable coastal resources and to fully engage with the public is required by law.

The data gathered through a programmatic EIS are invaluable to individual project review. data are the foundation for baseline project standards and provide MMS with the information it accurately determine how individual projects need to built or sited to best mitigate the cumulative impact of alternative energy development. In short premature project review will be at best inadequate and are certain to undercut MMS' ability to mitigate regional Furthermore, proceeding with project level impacts. before the programmatic EIS is reviews complete deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to 1 to participate.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

When public trust resources as immensely Nantucket Sound are important as at stake public participation cannot be handicapped by unreasonably requiring stakeholders to consider a project without knowing what the standards will be that apply. Federal agencies have a duty to look out for the best interests environment; to be the counterweight prevents private interests from exploiting federal resources to the detriment of the public trust. As stewards of the OCS resource MMS must ensure that the programmatic EIS for offshore alternative energy development reflects a scientifically conservative and environmentally protective approach.

The programmatic EIS must look broadly at alternatives and impacts, require rigorous studies, and resolve public conflict with the aim to achieving the greatest return for the public overall. I refer you to the Alliance's comments on response to the advance notice of proposed rule making submitted on February 22nd, 2006 and encourage you to use detailed regulatory framework recommended therein as the basis for the PEIS. And I thank you for your time.

MS. SMITH: Thank you very much. And if you want to hand in any written comments that's fine.

Okay. Yes, if you speak [] by the way if you speak

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

tonight that doesn't preclude you from also sending in comments by mail or [] or through website. You can vote many times, I guess. Dennis Quaranta and I apologize if I mispronounced your last name.

MR. QUARANTA: Dennis Quaranta, President of Winergy Power. It is our hope that as we go through we'll look process that at the everything that's been done in Europe. There's over 20 wind farms that have been built over there. Lots of studies that have been over there, but we need to move our country towards energy independence and we hope that as we try to site these offshore wind $\[\]$ wind turbines that will help us move toward independence so that we're not tied into a very very long regulatory process.

We're hoping that we can see different designs and different things that other companies are are looking at. Look at each each company on a on a individual basis, see what they have to offer, what they have different than the other companies and take a look at that and hopefully fast track some of these things. The new companies that are coming out and trying to do this we're really in a pioneering stage. This is something very very different that hasn't been done before.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We really need to look at this, study it, get some of these built out there and at that time look at some of the studies and see if there is really any any kind of environmental impact, but I think we can see from what has been done in Europe that the impacts are very very minimal and the benefits far out weigh any kind of impact that there have been. So it is our hope that as we look at this that we can take this process and do some fast track are tracking on it and get these wind farms in built in a reasonable amount of time.

Just on the I on the siting and the studies and everything that'd have to get done if we were to begin this process now it would be two or three or four years before we could actually start building these wind farms. So we don't really want to delay that process and be two or three years down the road and be seven or eight or nine or ten years out before the first ones can be built.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. Now the next individual who signed up is Carolyn Elefant.

MS. ELEFANT: Good evening. My name is Carolyn Elefant. I'm an attorney in Washington D.C. and I'm also the CEO of the Ocean Renewable Energy Coalition or OREC. OREC is a 501C3 trade association,

which is dedicated to the advancement of the commercial commercialization of all and types of offshore renewables we support I we're technology neutral and we offshore offshore support wind, wave, hydrogen projects, any types of renewable projects that can wean us from our dependence from foreign oil. Tonight we're here to comment on this EIS scoping process and as we heard in the comments before one of the issues to be addressed in the scoping process are alternatives.

We have to examine what our alternatives are, especially our alternatives to no action. And we will begin by addressing some of the implications of taking no action. We think that a process that ends in an ownerous regulatory scheme or a scheme that involves duplication of efforts or an extensive regulatory acceptable alternative. process is not an These alternatives are not acceptable, because they will kill П the offshore nascent nascent renewable industry, which caries with it the opportunities to free us from dependence on foreign oil and also from opportunities to create a robust economy based on offshore technology.

Now some of the alternatives that MMS should be examining, first I'll discuss the scope of the EIS. We believe that the scope of this EIS should

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

cover all potential technologies, not just focus on specific near term technologies like offshore wind, but look ahead to the possibilities for offshore wave and also tidal. Right now in Europe there are significant advancements that have been [] that are being made on the offshore wave and tidal scene and part of that is because of government support.

Other countries such as Portugal is right now [] the Portuguese utility has a contract for the world's first commercial wave energy project, which would utilize the Palamis technology. If we focus too much on just near term technologies we will obscure and possibly forgo the opportunity for developing other parts of the [] other types of offshore technologies. Other measures that we should exam [] other aspects of a programmatic [] a program of development for offshore renewables, first and foremost we support a streamline process for permitting projects.

streamline We support а process for technologies commercial and we believe programmatic approach will yield that result, because when you look at the impact from a programmatic approach it gives developers an opportunity to do site specific assessments later on and so we believe that the programmatic approach will help to promote a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

streamline process. At the same time there are many new demonstration technologies that are ready to go now and we cannot have those projects stymied either by waiting for a programmatic approach to go through or by the implementation of regulations, which are so ownerous that small developers can't [] cannot comply with them.

I heard a statistic actually just recently that for some of these offshore projects the project itself might cost \$5 million to develop a prototype and then developers are spending \$2 million on regulation and permitting. That's too large a proportion to be spent on regulatory [] on the regulatory process and it's something that will stymie development and deter investment.

Other that measures OREC supports develop offshore technology, we would ask MMS to look of the economic impacts as part environmental impact statement as it's required to do by NEPA and some of the economic impacts that should be examined are the impact of exorbitant lease fees. support lease fees [] that [] we support reasonable lease fees based on \(\begin{aligned} \text{on production will grace periods for } \end{aligned} \) demonstration and pre-commercial projects. want lease fees set in such a way so that they maximize

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the benefits of production tax credits and other governmental credits that are being given to stimulate this renewable industry. In other words we don't

want one arm of the government to detract from benefits that are provided to this industry by another arm of the government.

Me do support a systematic approach for mapping these resources, not just for wind, but for offshore wave and for title and we hope that there is something that MMS can do as part of this process to free funds from Congress to get offshore and up to date mapping of wave energy and title energy resources underway. We ask MMS to avoid taking any measures that would stifle emerging technologies. I made this remark already, but I feel that it's important to emphasis it, not to just focus on what's in the near term, because there are many other technologies besides offshore wind that are in the near term and if we focus too much on one we really forgo the opportunity for developing others.

It's best for us to diversify our portfolio and to try to develop as many resources as possible and to develop resources that are adaptable or that comport to the environmental characteristics of a specific area. We also ask that MMS try to resolve any

NEAL R. GROSS

jurisdictional conflicts that either exist with other federal agencies or state agencies and come up with ways to cooperate with those agencies and also as these regulations are moving forward we do understand that MMS wants to get this right. We want as [] as a trade association for this industry we want to see this program [] this industry [] this agency get the process right also.

think that Europe the We has gotten process right, which is why they have had the progress that they have. But at the same time as we move forward we have to have some procedure in place for interim mechanisms for projects that are ready to deploy now. Right now there are small prototypes that are ready to move forward. They have investors behind them, but investors do not want to wait four or five years to invest in a prototype that may not come to commercial fruition for another 10 to 15 years. So it's very important to address those demo projects and either and and put together some sort of system for projects permitted permitted getting those And finally we also ask MMS to look at some of the alternatives it talked about with respect to its jurisdiction over existing platforms.

We support either a platforms to powers

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

program or rigs to renewables program or renewables program where those existing resources can be converted into viable renewable resources and we'd ask MMS to use whatever jurisdiction it has to make sure that that happens. We think that there are really so many opportunities that we have with this program and we look to MMS and we're we're very gratified that MMS is trying to take advantage of this opportunity that it has to start from a clean slate and develop this industry and OREC looks forward to working with MMS and to providing whatever support is needed to make sure that we can succeed. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. The next individual signed up to speak is Michael Fry.

MR. FRY: My name is Michael Fry, I'm an avian biologist with the American Bird Conservancy in Washington D.C. . I'm primarily an avian toxicologist. I'm very pleased that MMS has been authorized to manage and regulate offshore renewable energy and especially in light of the good track record MMS has had in maintaining regulation of offshore oil and gas. MMS has developed an excellent OCS environmental studies program and this should carry out [] carry over to their environmental [] they're alternative energy.

MMS also has great expertise in dealing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with large offshore structures, which would be important aspect of insuring stability of the projects As these renewable energy and alternative offshore. energy projects go forward I would like to make sure that MMS that adequate environmental ensures assessments are performed to protect birds, fisheries, bentic resources, marine mammals, and turtles. that must be conducted prior to construction of projects and then it's very important to assess and monitor adverse effects after construction. heard a great deal about EMF effects, electromotive effects.

We don't know what those effects are [] I think there are some conflicts between offshore uses that need to be resolved so with MMS sand and gravel program as well as utilizing offshore shoals there. There are certainly conflicts with fisheries, although, there's a very great potential for having some of these offshore wind farms even function as fish refuge in areas where there has been offshore over fishing.

I want to ensure [] have MMS ensure that they provide a mechanism for adequate mitigation of impacts of offshore energy projects, including visual impacts which could be mitigated onshore in a variety of different ways, but then certainly wildlife and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

fisheries impacts fisheries impacts need to be mitigated in some fashion to ensure that the offshore energy is truly green energy and there's going to be a great deal of concern, I believe, especially in the northeast with the protection of marine mammal, especially white whales. Thank you very much.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. The last person signed up to speak is Sashe Annete.

MS. ANNETE: Good evening. I'm Sashe Annete. I am an environmental media strategist. I also have a production company that is focusing at the moment on producing events to raise awareness for these very important issues. I would like to thank all of you for this opportunity tonight and particularly Dr. Thresher for your very impassioned presentation. I agree with you. We do not have a choice and what I think people need to realize is that this is not about policy and regulation, with all due respect to those very important parts of this process.

This is about one people on one planet and I think that all involved parties need to make a commitment to each other that we might need to think about other ways of getting things done, because we do not have time. We are already way, way behind the clock. I think that I speak for a lot of us in this

1	profession and in this industry and when I say that I'm
2	I I'm not willing to accept the lag in time and issues,
3	you know, like aesthetic impact, taking up too much of
4	Of this process, so I I I am very hopeful that we can
5	find a new way to [to move this through. Thank you.
6	MS. SMITH: Thank you. Well that gets us
7	through the [] the list of people who signed up when
8	they registered that they wanted to provide a comment
9	and so now we're going to open the floor if there's
10	anybody else who would like to comment we have a person
11	at the back. We'll give everybody an opportunity.
12	MR. LINK: Good evening and thank you for
13	I for allowing me to address you. I want I want to make
14	an apology first; I apologize that you and I are
15	wearing a similar colored shirt. I apologize that have
16	almost the same outfit on as Terry back there.
17	MS. SMITH: Can [] can you provide your
18	name and
19	MR. LINK: Yes.
20	MS. SMITH: Affiliation?
21	MR. LINK: Oh. After I said that now I
22	have to do that, right.
23	MS. SMITH: Yes. Now you do.
24	MR. LINK: My name is Bob Link from a
25	company called Winergy Power, LLC. I'm the permit

compliance officer. Again, thank you very much. the writing and the setting up of the scope that I that you're about to undertake I would like one or two things possibly to be considered. Number one, if you follow the European model all of their projects, even Horns Rev, even Knifesbed, Middlegrunden (phonetic), turbines, even 80 they're all demonstration projects. They are not considered commercial projects until they get to the second set of Knifesbed and the second set of Horns Rev. When you're setting this up make a provision within your scope for demonstration or pilot projects. I think that would be very good. Your sign over there says Minerals Management, Minerals Revenue and Stewardship.

Stewardshp means you are to protect all sorts of various assets. Those assets could be birds, fish, marine mammals. Put something into your scope that addresses the societal benefits, because the other asset is us poor people and we're not addressed in [] in a typical scope. So if you could do [] put those two things into that scope I think that would make for a far better document. Thank you very much. Have a great day.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. Would anybody else like to come up and make remarks, provide comments,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	66
1	critique our attire? Well we [] this is where I kill
2	time while somebody works up a question or comment, we
3	will be here after we break from this formal session
4	and folks from MMS will be available for some
5	additional discussions. I would suggest unless anybody
6	else wants to stand up and make a formal comment that
7	we probably ought to adjourn from this portion of the

session. Does that work for you Walter? Going once,

going twice. I guess we're we're done then with the

10 formal comment process.

> I I want to thank all MR. CRUICKSHANK: of you for coming out and participating. We do value your input and if you didn't speak today or did and have some additional thoughts please take advantage of the other opportunities to get your thoughts into us on on scoping this programmatic EIS. I thank you all for coming and as Karen said some of us will be sticking around a little while if there's [there's more things you want to talk about.

> (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 8:01 p.m.)

22

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23